



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1990/SR.9

16 May 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1990

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 9th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 11 May 1990, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. GHAREKHAN

(India)

CONTENTS

Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (continued)

International co-operation in the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

90-55604 2506S (E)

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SECOND DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (E/1990/20 and Add.1)

Mr. AYALA LASSO (Ecuador) said that the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa should serve as the framework for the Organization's efforts to eradicate racism and racial discrimination. The persistence of any form of discrimination was an insult to mankind and to the fundamental principles on which society was based.

Apartheid was undoubtedly the most grotesque form of discrimination. The recent positive steps taken by the South African Government should not change the world's perception of apartheid. That system must be abolished.

Discriminatory practices persisted in other parts of the world also, and sometimes took the form of xenophobia or inhuman treatment of immigrant workers and the denial of their rights. The international community must be alert to such situations and take all possible steps to deal with them.

He joined with those delegations which had expressed concern at the financial difficulties impeding the work of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), and expressed the hope that those problems could be quickly resolved. He also appreciated the efforts undertaken by the Co-ordinator for the Second Decade.

Mr. SAO (Cameroon) said that the pledge taken by the international community to struggle against racism and racial discrimination was certainly one of the most moving testimonies to international solidarity.

His delegation applauded the leading role played by the United Nations in that struggle and acknowledged the excellent report, which drew attention to the many activities undertaken under the Programme of Action, in particular the information and awareness activities undertaken by the Under-Secretary-General for Human Rights. Those activities would benefit from further support from Member States,

(Mr. Sao, Cameroon)

especially those in a position to influence world opinion. The Council should also promote the holding of seminars, meetings and other events to raise public awareness about the harmful effects of racism and racial discrimination.

Mention should also be made of the significant contribution of non-governmental organizations to the implementation of the Programme of Action. He therefore welcomed the news that the Co-ordinator intended to give a high priority to strengthening contacts and co-operation with those organizations.

Laws and regulations were not, in and of themselves, sufficient to combat racism and racial discrimination. Accordingly, in addition to its constitutional guarantees, his country attached great importance to information, education and training. A large part of the school curriculum was devoted to examining the destructive consequences of racism.

He noted with satisfaction that there had been unanimous agreement within the international community on the need to dismantle apartheid and to establish a democratic and non-racial society in South Africa. The release of Nelson Mandela had yet to be followed by steps which would confirm the Pretoria Government's intentions, such as the lifting of the state of emergency, the release of all political prisoners and the abolition of apartheid. Accordingly, it was essential to maintain and, if need be, to strengthen the sanctions against South Africa, so long as Pretoria refused to honour the values of the late twentieth century. The international community must be united in action as well as in principle in order to achieve the objectives of the Second Decade.

Mr. RUKASHAZA (Rwanda) said that the recent admission of Namibia to the United Nations fostered the hope that similar progress could be made with regard to the eradication of the apartheid system in South Africa and an end to the destabilization of the countries in the region.

Racial discrimination in general, and apartheid in particular, was one of the crucial problems confronting the United Nations. The issue of apartheid had been on the agenda of the General Assembly since 1946, and was still one of the international community's primary concerns.

His Government reaffirmed its total rejection of apartheid and racial discrimination, and its unswerving solidarity with the countries, peoples and liberation movements fighting to end the systematic denial of human rights. Rwanda

(Mr. Rukashaza, Rwanda)

had expressed its commitment not only by signing and ratifying most of the international human rights instruments, but also by incorporating them into its national legislation. Despite its meagre resources, it also endeavoured to fulfil its financial and reporting obligations under the relevant conventions.

In accordance with the measures outlined in the Programme of Action to isolate the racist South African régime, his country maintained no diplomatic, commercial or other relations with South Africa. The importation of South African goods was banned, and South African aircraft could not land at Rwanda's airports or fly over its territory.

His country was also raising the awareness of the Rwandese people through the mass media, political speeches, school curricula and by disseminating copies of the international human rights instruments in the national language.

Despite the emergence of a broad consensus that apartheid was a crime against humanity and must be dismantled, differences remained as to how that objective could best be achieved. His delegation remained convinced that the only effective means would be by imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, increasing South Africa's isolation, and supporting the liberation struggle against apartheid.

Greater support should be given to CERD; he deplored the fact that inadequate financial resources had forced the cancellation of its 1990 session. For its part, his Government had paid its entire contribution, and he urged all States to do likewise.

Mr. MORA GODOY (Cuba) said that it was essential to increase the activities undertaken at all levels to eliminate racial discrimination. In recent years, there had been a resurgence of Nazi, Fascist and neo-Fascist groups in Europe and the United States. If the Governments concerned did not act promptly and firmly, those racist tendencies would develop and pave the way for increased discrimination, particularly against immigrant workers.

Apartheid was the most repulsive form of racism. It was also the chief cause of instability in southern Africa. Together with the rest of the international community, his Government hoped that the recent steps taken by Pretoria might lead to the abolition of apartheid. However, the continuing state of emergency and other repressive practices were hindering further progress. The negotiating process was also encountering strong resistance from sectors of the white minority,

(Mr. Mora Godoy, Cuba)

which clearly did not intend to abolish apartheid but merely to modify it. The willingness of some Governments to lift sanctions and to establish diplomatic relations with Pretoria did nothing to promote a dialogue.

The birth of an independent and sovereign State in Namibia had been an occasion for rejoicing. He took satisfaction in the fact that the negotiations between Angola, South Africa and Cuba, with the participation of the Soviet Union and the United States as observers, had promoted the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) concerning Namibian independence. That had been possible only because of the defeats inflicted on the racist forces by Angolan and Cuban troops and those of the South West Africa People's Organization, and because of the heroic resistance of the Namibian people.

The Cuban Revolution had maintained its unshakable commitment to the African peoples struggling for their national liberation. More than 400,000 Cubans had fulfilled their internationalist duty in Angola, when that country's independence had been threatened by the South African racists, and thousands more were serving as technicians, teachers and doctors in other African countries. More than 12,000 African students from various countries were receiving a free education in Cuba.

The Palestinian people was also the victim of discrimination at the hands of the Israeli Government. He firmly supported the struggle of the Palestinian people and the Palestine Liberation Organization, its sole legitimate representative.

Manifestations of racism and racial discrimination had also increased in the United States. Not only did that country have a consistently interventionist policy with regard to the peoples south of the Río Grande, but internally, native Americans, blacks, Hispanics and other minorities were subject to humiliation and treated as third-class citizens. There had been an alarming upsurge in the activities of white racist groups. The life expectancy of black people in Harlem was lower than in the most underdeveloped parts of Asia. American Indians suffered from poverty and disease and had also been the victims of inhuman mass sterilization campaigns. Nearly half the Spanish-speaking population lived below the official poverty level. Such racist and discriminatory practices should not escape the attention of the international community, which should seek to ensure that minority rights were respected in the most highly industrialized country in the world.

READER
PICKS

/...

Mrs. SHANKAYA (Zambia) welcomed the continuing activities of the Centre against Apartheid and the Special Committee against Apartheid, but observed with regret that one of the founding members of the Special Committee was planning to establish diplomatic, economic and commercial contacts with South Africa. That was a very dangerous step.

The activities of the Centre on Transnational Corporations in implementing the Programme of Action were impressive. The Centre had done a great deal to mobilize public opinion to induce Governments and transnational corporations to refrain from any kind of collaboration with the racist Pretoria régime. Governments should give serious consideration to the report of the Panel of Eminent Persons established to conduct Public Hearings on the Activities of Transnational Corporations in South Africa and Namibia, which had been prepared by the Centre. Her delegation welcomed the adoption by the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its sixteenth session of a resolution on the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa.

There were great misconceptions about the activities of transnational corporations in South Africa. It was generally believed that transnational corporations played a positive role in the development process. In fact, very few corporations in South Africa were making concerted efforts to develop the skills of the black labour force, which continued to be thoroughly exploited. Such negative trends prevailed despite the existence of codes of conduct concerning employment practices of transnational corporations operating in South Africa.

Zambia welcomed the importance which the Commission on Human Rights attached to the situation in southern Africa, and commended the work of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities with respect to the Programme of Action for the Second Decade. Her delegation supported the Sub-Commission's recommendation that the final report of the Special Rapporteur on the achievements made and obstacles encountered during the Decade should be published and widely distributed.

The financial difficulties of CERD required an urgent solution, since the implementation of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination would be hampered as long as that situation persisted. Her delegation regretted that the Committee had found it necessary to cancel a number of its sessions.

/...

(Mrs. Shankaya, Zambia)

The contributions which the Council for Namibia had made since its inception in May 1967 were well known, and the international community should provide generous assistance to enable Namibia to consolidate its independence.

Zambia commended the work of the Co-ordinator for the Second Decade and welcomed his initiative to intensify co-operation between his office and the Centre against Apartheid and the Centre on Transnational Corporations.

In many countries, the presence of migrant workers had become a major political problem, and her delegation believed that constructive co-operation in international development could ensure an equitable distribution of development opportunities and could help check the process of migration, especially South-North migration.

In its observations on the implementation of the Programme of Action, the World Bank had indicated that it was obliged by its Articles of Agreement to take into account only economic considerations in its decision-making. At the same time, however, it had been spreading the idea of political conditionality in Africa's development programmes. Zambia believed that the World Bank should provide a more credible excuse for its apparent unwillingness to participate in the implementation of the Programme of Action.

Ms. BACHTOBJI (Tunisia) said that while the reforms announced by the Pretoria régime with the aim of reducing its international isolation, the freeing of political prisoners, notably Mr. Nelson Mandela, and the opening of exploratory talks between President de Klerk and the African National Congress were welcome, nothing basically had been changed. There would be no genuine change until the apartheid régime had been totally eradicated. Global and mandatory sanctions were still the only effective means of achieving that aim and thereby establishing peace and stability in southern Africa.

Another manifestation of racism and racial discrimination was the repression practised by Israel against the Palestinian people, whose heroic resistance, illustrated by the intifadah, was a constant reminder that only the just and global settlement of the Palestine question and the Middle East conflict in general would put an end to the threats to peace and security in the region.

/...

(Ms. Bachtobji, Tunisia)

A third manifestation of racism was that experienced by migrant workers, and her delegation noted with concern the upsurge, especially in recent months, of racism and xenophobia in certain host countries. Her delegation called upon those countries to take, or to strengthen, measures against racism, and to guarantee the protection and preserve the dignity of migrant workers. Her delegation reiterated its hope that the future convention on the subject would receive the support of the entire international community.

While welcoming the continuous efforts made by the United Nations system in terms of implementing the Programme of Action for the Second Decade, her delegation had noted with regret that the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination had recently had to cancel a session due to a lack of resources. States Parties must meet their financial obligations; in the interim the General Assembly might consider making funds available, on a temporary basis, to bodies whose very existence was sometimes under threat.

Mr. AMER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that racism and racial discrimination were incompatible with divine law and constituted a crime against humanity and the values of civilization. Although positive developments had recently taken place in southern Africa, the South African authorities continued to practise their policy, which was based on racial discrimination, and had not lifted the state of emergency. The international community must put an end to the inhuman practices of the Pretoria régime, and the best way of doing that was by boycotting it, imposing the most severe sanctions and providing every kind of assistance and solidarity to the national liberation movements and to the front-line States of southern Africa.

There was another régime whose nature and whose policies of oppression and aggression were similar to those of South Africa. The international community had recognized the similarity between the Pretoria régime and the racist Zionist entity in the occupied territories, and the serious threat which the two régimes posed to security in the African and Arab regions.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya condemned all practices of racist régimes and supported all efforts that were made to combat their crimes. It was a party to all international conventions calling for an end to all forms of racial discrimination, and to all human rights covenants. It stood side by side with the Palestinian

(Mr. Amer, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

people, and supported the heroic resistance of the front-line States of southern Africa. In implementing the Programmes for the Second Decade, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya longed for the day when the people of South Africa would free themselves from the yoke of colonialism and racism and the people of Palestine would attain their right to return to their homeland and to establish their own independent State.

Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) said that it was a matter of deep concern that, despite consistent international efforts, the abhorrent system of apartheid, one of the most evil and vicious doctrines ever devised by man, continued to be practised in South Africa. Permanent peace and stability in southern Africa could be attained only when the apartheid system had been totally demolished.

The Pretoria régime had recently taken some steps that gave rise to guarded optimism. The lifting of the ban on the African National Congress which accompanied the freeing of Nelson Mandela had been followed by talks between the African National Congress and the Pretoria régime, and that had been a step in the right direction. However, the road ahead remained long and difficult: the state of emergency remained in place, the unconditional amnesty of all political prisoners and exiles had not been granted, and the central pillars of apartheid were still standing.

International pressure against the Pretoria régime must be maintained. It was imperative that Security Council resolution 418 (1977) be strictly enforced, and that the General Assembly resolutions on comprehensive and mandatory sanctions and on an oil embargo be adhered to. Nothing short of complete isolation would compel the Pretoria régime to abandon the institutionalized monstrosity of racial discrimination.

Concerted efforts by the United Nations system as a whole were needed for the successful implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade. The year 1990 marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption by the General Assembly of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and 20 years of the activities of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. The financial crisis facing that Committee was a source of concern, and he called on all States parties to honour their obligations in order to enable it to carry out its work.

/...

(Mr. Ahmed, Pakistan)

Pakistan had maintained a comprehensive boycott of the Pretoria régime for the past 42 years. In her message on the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the Prime Minister of Pakistan had stated that the Government and people of her country were unswervingly committed to the total eradication of racial discrimination and apartheid, and looked forward to the inevitable triumph of the forces of liberty and justice in South Africa.

Mrs. SHERMAN-PETER (Bahamas) said that the elimination of apartheid was a priority objective of the Second Decade. All Governments had a continuing responsibility to guarantee the full and equal enjoyment of human rights by all citizens, and to create conditions that removed barriers to racial equality. The Decade and its Programme of Action provided an excellent framework for action at all levels to combat racism and racial discrimination, and every effort must be made to maintain the momentum of the Decade through a dynamic, progressive and comprehensive programme in which the emphasis should continue to be placed on education, teaching and training and the dissemination of information for combating racism and racial discrimination.

It was essential to study the results achieved and the obstacles encountered during the First Decade and the first half of the Second Decade, and one activity that would be vital was the seminar on political, historical, economic, social and cultural factors contributing to racism, racial discrimination and apartheid to be held later in 1990.

She commended the tireless efforts of the Special Committee against Apartheid, and noted that the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination stood as the international human rights instrument that was closest to universality. However, CERD was regrettably, in its twentieth year, experiencing financial and other difficulties which had compelled it to cancel its spring session. Her delegation was of the view that the time had come for a firm decision to be taken regarding the funding of CERD in order to ensure that it functioned efficiently on a firm and predictable basis. It was also regrettable that the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid had not commanded universal acceptance, for although there appeared to be movement towards changing the status quo in South Africa, the best demonstration of

(Mrs. Sherman-Peter, Bahamas)

serious commitment to the elimination of apartheid was through ratification of, or accession to, that Convention.

The Bahamas did not believe that the Government of South Africa had changed its policies as a result of enlightened self-interest. Internal dissent by the majority, coupled with international pressure, had compelled that country to rethink its apartheid policy and obliged it to take action which had long been advocated by the international community. In spite of a number of welcome developments, the state of emergency remained in force, many political prisoners remained in gaol, the seeds of division and strife which had been deliberately sown continued to erupt in violence, and, most important of all, the legal and administrative pillars of apartheid remained untouched. Much compromise, particularly on the part of the Government of South Africa, would be required to narrow the gulf dividing it from the black majority and from other organizations and individuals opposed to apartheid.

It was not possible to be certain whether the limited steps taken by the Government of South Africa were intended to meet the objective of a transition to majority rule or were intended only to give the appearance of such movement. In any event, the Bahamas considered that those steps were not sufficient justification for easing international pressure. While the process of negotiations must be actively promoted and supported, a comprehensive and coherent policy towards South Africa had to be maintained until the system of apartheid was ended. The Government of South Africa must be encouraged, particularly by those with influence, to grasp the opportunity peacefully to close a most disgraceful chapter in its history, and in the history of mankind, by taking the necessary steps to create a non-racial, democratic, egalitarian society. The end of apartheid could lead to the solution of long-standing regional problems in southern Africa, many of which were of South Africa's creation.

The remaining years of the Second Decade should be utilized to maintain the elimination of racism and racial discrimination as an immediate and urgent issue, and the conclusions and recommendations of the Council were vital to that process, in which the Bahamas would continue to co-operate fully.

/...

Mr. VILCHEZ (Nicaragua) welcomed the efforts of the Special Committee against Apartheid to monitor the situation in South Africa and to promote international campaigns for the isolation of the apartheid régime. One of the Committee's main objectives was to mobilize world public opinion in order to pressure South Africa to end apartheid. In that connection, his delegation had joined in the adoption by consensus of the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa.

As a State party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Nicaragua endorsed the request of CERD that States parties should meet their financial obligations under article 8, paragraph 6 of the Convention. Nicaragua welcomed the release of Nelson Mandela, which signalled the initiation of a process which could lead to the total eradication of apartheid. It applauded efforts to negotiate political solutions to the South African crisis and hoped that the discussions would lead to agreements which were satisfactory to both parties and would return to the South African people their freedom, sovereignty and independence.

Nicaragua fully endorsed resolution 1990/13 of the Commission on Human Rights, which invited the Secretary-General to ensure the effective implementation of the activities remaining under the first half of the Decade and to proceed with the implementation of the activities for the second half.

Nicaragua was a multi-ethnic nation and its Constitution guaranteed that all persons were equal before the law and prohibited discrimination. It further established the inviolability of the rights of the Atlantic coast minority communities. The National Assembly had recently enacted legislation concerning the granting of autonomy to the minority populations of the Atlantic coast region. Those populations had participated fully in the recent elections in Nicaragua, gaining ample representation in the National Assembly and within the autonomous Governments of the Atlantic coast. None of that would have been possible without the political will of the Nicaraguan people.

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE ELIMINATION OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE ACCIDENT
AT THE CHERNOBYL NUCLEAR POWER PLANT (continued) (E/1990/64)

Draft resolution E/1990/L.21

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian SSR), introducing draft resolution E/1990/L.21 on behalf of Algeria, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nicaragua, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Zaire and Zambia, said that, according to scientific calculations, the radioactive effects of the Chernobyl accident were equivalent to the explosion of 90 atomic bombs of the type dropped on Hiroshima. At the time of the disaster, it had not been possible to assess its dimensions or foresee its consequences. Chernobyl had affected the lives of millions of people in various countries, and the ecological repercussions of the disaster required a solution of new and exceptionally complex problems relating to practically all aspects of human life.

The USSR, with the assistance of international organizations, had sought to mitigate the disastrous effects of the radioactive contamination of its population and to reduce the scale of environmental pollution. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) had made a significant and timely contribution to the mitigation of the accident's effects. An international group of experts organized by IAEA was currently studying the situation in the Chernobyl area and would issue recommendations for the protection of the population living in contaminated areas. The World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and a number of international non-governmental organizations, charities and individuals had also been of great assistance.

The consequences of the nuclear accident required international co-operation, and his delegation hoped that the United Nations would act as co-ordinator of concerted efforts to deal with the effects of the disaster. The experience of international co-operation in eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster could later be used for the protection of man and the natural environment from possible future nuclear accidents.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The draft resolution was short and its provisions were self-explanatory. His delegation hoped that the Council would adopt by consensus the draft resolution at its current session.

Mr. BRADY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the twelve States members of the European Community, said that the Community welcomed the addition of the item to the Council's agenda. In the spirit of co-operation, it had worked together with the peoples affected and their Governments to alleviate the terrible consequences of the disaster. Such joint efforts in the area of humanitarian relief and scientific co-operation, including evaluations by European experts of the scope of the accident, would most certainly continue. Account must also be taken of the efforts of IAEA, the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR) and the other relevant United Nations bodies. The item warranted further consideration at the Council's session in July 1990.

Mr. KIRSCH (Canada) thanked the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR for its frank and comprehensive review of the efforts to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl nuclear accident and also associated his delegation with the sentiments expressed by other delegations in face of the challenges posed by such an event.

His Government was working closely with all the international organizations involved to develop an effective multilateral programme of assistance to the Soviet Union. It was also evaluating a request from the Soviet Government for medical equipment and supplies for victims of the accident. The 1989 Canada-USSR nuclear co-operation agreement would provide a valuable framework for Canadian bilateral assistance to the USSR.

In the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident, IAEA had played a leading role in galvanizing international co-operation. It had provided immediate assistance at the time of the accident and had co-ordinated the negotiation of the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency. The Agency had also established and incorporated into its regular programme a Special Nuclear Safety Programme (SNSP). In 1989, the Soviet Government had proposed a joint agreement between the USSR and IAEA on a framework for on-site post-accident international research at the Chernobyl Research Centre. Several United Nations agencies and

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

individual Member States, including Canada, were expected to participate and a proposal for the research centre would go before the IAEA in June 1990.

While supporting the importance of international co-operation in eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl nuclear accident, his delegation hoped that the nature and scope of international assistance could be more precisely defined, thus strengthening the guiding role played by IAEA and avoiding duplication of effort.

Mrs. DIEGUEZ (Mexico) noted that it was often said that the Council did not fully exercise its co-ordinating function. In acting as co-ordinator of international co-operation to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl accident, the Council would have an excellent opportunity to demonstrate its effectiveness.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to express its sympathy at the extent and seriousness of the tragedy which had occurred in the Ukrainian SSR and to applaud the frankness with which the subject had been discussed.

While acknowledging the important efforts already made to mitigate the consequences of the Chernobyl accident, he emphasized the importance of current activities. IAEA was in the process of conducting an international assessment of the radiological consequences of the Chernobyl accident. The project, which would involve a team of international experts and various international organizations, included a survey of the health and environmental effects of the Chernobyl accident, corroboration of Soviet data and an evaluation of protective measures that had been taken. It would also make recommendations with respect to future actions in the affected regions. The implementation phase was scheduled to begin in May 1990 and to be completed towards the end of the year. The results would be published by IAEA.

IAEA and its collaborators should be permitted to complete their work before new efforts in that area were initiated.

Mr. DUHS (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that the tragic accident at Chernobyl had had serious consequences not only for the peoples of the Soviet Union but for other populations. Such an accident reminded the international community that modern technology was acceptable only if full consideration were given to its effects on human health and the environment.

(Mr. Duhs, Sweden)

The Nordic countries urged all States to ensure the highest standards of safety for their national nuclear energy programmes. To reduce present risk levels, there should be mandatory periodic reviews of all existing nuclear reactors and their safety performances based on current standards.

The Nordic countries supported the work of IAEA in developing internationally acceptable safety regulations which included the entire fuel cycle and all categories of nuclear waste. They urged all countries to make further use of IAEA services to enhance the safety of their nuclear installations. Finally, he expressed the sympathy of the Nordic countries for the victims of the Chernobyl accident.

Mr. MATNAI (Observer for Israel) said that his country appreciated the frankness of the Soviet Union in addressing the consequences of the Chernobyl accident. Disasters of that magnitude should enhance international solidarity and co-operation. Israel had responded immediately to the tragedy with offers of co-operation, just as it had responded in the past to requests for assistance from the Soviet Union. In that same spirit, it offered its continuing co-operation in any endeavour to aid the victims of the Chernobyl accident.

Mr. ANDEMICAEL (International Atomic Energy Agency) said that IAEA was organizing a major project with the participation of experts from FAO, WHO, UNSCEAR and the Commission of the European Communities. The survey, which would be conducted by a team of independent international experts, would cover health and environment effects and evaluate the protective measures taken by the Soviet authorities. IAEA would publish the findings of the survey later in the year and would arrange for open meetings at which the results of the survey could be examined.

A preliminary meeting between officials of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR and IAEA had been held in Moscow from 7 to 9 February 1990 to outline a plan of action to carry out an assessment of the concept which the USSR had evolved to enable the population to live safely in areas affected by radioactive contamination following the Chernobyl accident, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of the steps taken in those areas to safeguard the health of the population. A preparatory mission of international experts had been subsequently

(Mr. Andemicael, IAEA)

organized to identify the major assessments to be made. The experts had visited the affected areas and had drafted a work plan based on the information collected.

The results of the preparatory mission had been submitted to an international advisory committee which had met at Kiev and Minsk from 23 to 27 April 1990. The committee had approved the work plan.

Approximately 100 international experts would be involved in the implementation of the project which would comprise five major tasks: historical portrayal of the events leading to the current situation and description of the current status; corroboration of assessments of environmental contamination; corroboration of individual and collective dose assessments; clinical health effects from radiation exposure and evaluation of the general health situation; and evaluation of protective measures. In addition to the five major tasks, specialist meetings involving international and local experts in medical and agricultural sciences would be arranged. After the completion of the project in late 1990, an authoritative report would be prepared by the international advisory committee and published by IAEA. The report would form the basis for subsequent follow-up studies.

Mr. IWASAKI (World Health Organization) said that WHO had already participated in a mission to the affected areas and would produce a detailed evaluation of the health situation in those areas.

In April 1990, the Ministry of Health of the Soviet Union and WHO had signed a memorandum of understanding calling for the establishment, under the auspices of WHO, of a long-term global programme to monitor and mitigate the health effects of the Chernobyl accident.

Mr. ARABIAT (Jordan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his country had been a co-sponsor of the draft resolution currently before the Council. Jordan, too, was exposed to the danger of a nuclear accident owing to the existence in Israel of nuclear weapons. That country, in order to demonstrate clearly its good intentions, should have stated that it was prepared to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

/...

The PRESIDENT said that, in the light of the statements just made, he wished to propose that the Council should return to the item at a later date. In the interim, he planned to be in contact with interested delegations with a view to arriving at a consensus decision.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS (continued) (E/1990/L.20)

Draft resolution E/1990/L.20

The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to the draft resolution entitled "Revival of the Ancient Library of Alexandria" and said that the following delegations wished to become co-sponsors: Belgium, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Italy, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Niger, Poland, Spain, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1990/SR.10

22 May 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1990

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 10th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 18 May 1990, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. GHAREKHAN

(India)

CONTENTS

Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism
and Racial Discrimination (continued)

International co-operation in the elimination of the consequences of the accident
at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working
languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a
copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this
document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference
Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SECOND DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (E/1990/20 and Add.1 and L.22)

Mr. OULD MOHAMED MAHMOUD (Observer for Mauritania), introducing draft resolution E/1990/L.22 on behalf of the Group of African States, said that racism and racial discrimination remained a problem for mankind despite the efforts undertaken to eradicate them. In South Africa, the harmful consequences of institutionalized racism were a daily fact of life. The international community should not ease its pressure on South Africa simply because of a few positive gestures by Pretoria.

The draft resolution before the Council, while similar to those adopted at previous sessions, had been changed to reflect new developments, including the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa adopted by the General Assembly at its sixteenth special session, and Namibia's achievement of independence. While taking into account the concerns aroused by the fact that some countries had extended invitations to the President of South Africa, the draft resolution invited governments to encourage positive changes in that country; he hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should take action on the draft resolution at a later meeting.

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE ELIMINATION OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE ACCIDENT AT THE CHERNOBYL NUCLEAR POWER PLANT (continued) (E/1990/64, L.21 and L.23)

The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft resolution E/1990/L.21, which had been introduced by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and to L.23, containing a draft decision which he had submitted.

Mr. MOHAMMED (Iraq) said that his delegation had joined the sponsors of draft resolution E/1990/L.21 because of Iraq's interest in all international efforts to enhance peace, security and stability, and to establish safeguards against future nuclear accidents. The safety of nuclear reactors was of particular

/...

(Mr. Mohammed, Iraq)

concern to Iraq because of the Israeli attack in 1981 on an Iraqi nuclear facility which, contrary to Israel's allegations, had been devoted to peaceful purposes. His country had called for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East; it supported Security Council resolution 487 (1981), calling upon Israel to place all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. All weapons of mass destruction, whether nuclear, chemical or biological, must be banned and international guarantees established to guard against future Israeli attacks on Arab facilities devoted to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Mr. KIURU (Finland) said that his delegation supported the procedure outlined in draft decision E/1990/L.23. With regard to paragraph (c), it would be useful for delegations to have the relevant information prior to the Council's next session.

The PRESIDENT said that delegations which were in a position to do so should make their information available in advance. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft decision.

It was so decided.

Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) urged the members of the Council to give careful consideration to the item with a view to adopting the draft resolution by consensus at the next session.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of the item.

The meeting rose at 11.05 a.m.



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1990/SR.11

4 June 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1990

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 11th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 23 May 1990, at 10 a.m.

President:

Mr. GHAREKHAN

(India)

CONTENTS

Elections, nominations and appointments

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

ELECTIONS, NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

Commission for Social Development (E/1990/L.2)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 11 members of the Commission for Social Development for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that Ghana, Guinea, Madagascar and Nigeria were candidates for the four vacancies to be filled by African States; Cyprus and the Islamic Republic of Iran were candidates for the two vacancies to be filled by Asian States; the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic had been endorsed for the vacancy to be filled by an Eastern European State; Argentina and the Dominican Republic were candidates for the two vacancies to be filled by the Latin American and Caribbean States; and Austria and Sweden were candidates for the two vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that since the number of candidates proposed by the Groups of African, Asian, Eastern European, Latin American and Caribbean, and Western European and other States equalled the number of vacancies to be filled from those groups, he would take it that the Council wished to elect them by acclamation.

It was so decided.

Commission on Human Rights (E/1990/L.2)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 15 members of the Commission on Human Rights for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that Burundi, Gambia, Mauritania and Zambia were candidates for the four vacancies to be filled by African States; Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Syrian Arab Republic had been recommended by their regional group for the three vacancies to be filled by Asian States, for which China, Japan and Sri Lanka were also candidates; Czechoslovakia, Poland and Romania were candidates for the vacancy to be filled by an Eastern European State; Argentina, Peru and Venezuela were candidates for the

/...

(Ms. Kimball)

three vacancies to be filled by Latin American and Caribbean States; and Australia, Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, Portugal and the United Kingdom were candidates for the four vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that since the nominees of the Groups of African and Latin American and Caribbean States equalled the number of vacancies to be filled from those groups, he would take it that the Council wished to elect them by acclamation.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect by secret ballot three members from the Group of Asian States, one member from the Group of Eastern European States and four members from the Group of Western European and other States.

Mr. MICU (Romania) said that his Government attached great importance to the promotion of human rights and had expressed interest in becoming a member of the Commission for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1991, but in view of a similar interest having been expressed by two friendly countries of the Group of Eastern European States and in a spirit of co-operation his Government was withdrawing its candidature in the hope of finding the understanding and support of the Council for its candidature next year.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Macaire (Burkina Faso) and Mrs. Vargas (Nicaragua) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	54
<u>Number of invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	54
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	54
<u>Required majority:</u>	28
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	

Asian States

Indonesia	39
Japan	39
China	35
Sri Lanka	16

/...

Iran (Islamic Republic of)	13
Syrian Arab Republic	11
<u>Eastern European States</u>	
Czechoslovakia	31
Poland	16
Romania	1
<u>Western European and other States</u>	
Austria	41
Germany, Federal Republic of	41
Portugal	41
Australia	39
United Kingdom	39
Ireland	3

The PRESIDENT said that a second ballot would be conducted between Australia and the United Kingdom to elect the fourth member from the Group of Western European and other States.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	54
<u>Number of invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	54
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	54
<u>Required majority:</u>	28
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	
Australia	31
United Kingdom	23

Having obtained the required majority, Australia, Austria, China, Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Japan and Portugal were elected members of the Commission on Human Rights for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Commission on the Status of Women (E/1990/L.2 and Add.1)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 11 members of the Commission on the Status of Women for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

/...

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that Côte d'Ivoire, Rwanda and Zaire were candidates for the three vacancies to be filled by African States; Bangladesh and the Philippines for the two vacancies to be filled by Asian States; Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the two vacancies to be filled by Eastern European States; Mexico for the vacancy to be filled by the Latin American and Caribbean States; and Italy, the Netherlands and the United States of America for the three vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that, since the nominees of the Groups of African States, Asian States, Latin American and Caribbean States and Western European and other States was equal to the number of vacancies to be filled from those groups, he would take it that the Council wished to elect them by acclamation.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect by secret ballot two members from the Group of Eastern European States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Van De Velde (Netherlands) and Mr. Wu Hai Long (China) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	54
<u>Number of invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	54
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	54
<u>Required majority:</u>	28
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	45
Bulgaria	28
Hungary	18
Czechoslovakia	13
Romania	1

Having obtained the required majority, Bulgaria and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were elected members of the Commission on the Status of Women for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Commission on Human Settlements (E/1990/L.3)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 20 members of the Commission on Human Settlements for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe were candidates for the six vacancies to be filled by African States; the Islamic Republic of Iran and Japan were candidates for the four vacancies to be filled by Asian States; Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were candidates for the two vacancies to be filled by Eastern European States; Antigua and Barbuda, Brazil, Chile and Colombia were candidates for the four vacancies to be filled by Latin American and Caribbean States; and Finland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States of America were candidates for the four vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that since the number of nominees endorsed by regional groups was equal to or less than the number of vacancies, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the nominees by acclamation, and to postpone to a later stage the elections for the remaining three vacancies for African States and two vacancies for Asian States.

It was so decided.

Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 19 members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that the respective regional groups had nominated Burundi, Ethiopia, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Sudan for the five vacancies to be filled by African States; of Cyprus, Iraq, Oman and the Philippines for the four vacancies to be filled by Asian States; Bulgaria and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the two vacancies to be filled by Eastern European States; Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba and Nicaragua for the four vacancies to be filled by Latin American and Caribbean States; and France, Greece, Ireland, Sweden, Turkey and the United States of America for the four vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that since the number of nominees of the Groups of African, Asian, Eastern European and Latin American and Caribbean States was equal to the number of vacancies, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the nominees by acclamation.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect by secret ballot four members from the Group of Western European and other States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sandoval (Ecuador) and Mr. Oliynyk (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	54
<u>Number of invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	54
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	54
<u>Required majority:</u>	28
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	
France	44
Ireland	42
Sweden	37
Greece	36
United States of America	29
Turkey	14

Having obtained the required majority and having received the largest number of votes, France, Greece, Ireland and Sweden were elected members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991. Committee on Natural Resources (E/1990/L.4)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 27 members of the Committee on Natural Resources for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that Burundi, Chad and Lesotho were candidates for the six vacancies to be filled by African States; the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mongolia and Thailand were candidates for the six vacancies to be filled by Asian States; Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic,

/...

(Ms. Kimball)

Hungary and Poland were candidates for the four vacancies to be filled by Eastern European States; Brazil and Suriname were candidates for the two vacancies to be filled by Latin American and Caribbean States; and Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America were candidates for the nine vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that since the number of nominees proposed by the regional groups was equal to or less than the number of vacancies he would take it that the Council wished to elect the candidates proposed and postpone to a later stage the election of three members from the Group of African States, three members from the Group of Asian States, one member from the Group of Eastern European States and five members from the Group of Western European and other States.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said that since no candidates had been proposed to fill the vacancies postponed from previous sessions from the Groups of African, Asian and Western European and other States, he invited the Council to postpone those elections to a later stage as well.

It was so decided.

Commission on Transnational Corporations (E/1990/L.5)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 16 members of the Commission on Transnational Corporations for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that the respective regional groups had endorsed the candidatures of Burundi, Ghana, Kenya and Zambia for the four vacancies to be filled by African States; of Bangladesh, India, Iraq and the Republic of Korea for the four vacancies to be filled by Asian States; of Bulgaria and Poland for the two vacancies to be filled by Eastern European States; of Chile and Colombia for two of the three vacancies to be filled by Latin American and Caribbean States; and of Belgium and Italy for two of the three vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that, since the number of nominees endorsed by the regional groups was equal to or less than the number of vacancies, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the nominees by acclamation and postpone to a later stage the elections for the remaining vacancies to be filled by the Groups of Latin American and Caribbean States and Western European and other States.

It was so decided.

/...

The PRESIDENT said that, with regard to the elections for the Commission on Transnational Corporations postponed from previous sessions, the Secretariat had been informed by the secretariat of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) that the African Group had endorsed the candidature of the United Republic of Tanzania for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1991. The Chairman of the Group of Asian States had informed the Secretariat that the Asian Group had endorsed Pakistan to fill a vacancy with a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1991 and the Philippines to fill a vacancy from 1 January 1991 to 31 December 1992.

If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the United Republic of Tanzania, Pakistan and the Philippines to those vacancies by acclamation.

It was so decided.

Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting (E/1990/L.6)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 11 members of the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that the respective regional groups had endorsed the candidatures of Morocco and Kenya for two of the five vacancies to be filled by African States; of China and Thailand for two of the three vacancies to be filled by Asian States; of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the vacancy to be filled by an Eastern European State; of Brazil and Mexico for two of the three vacancies to be filled by Latin American and Caribbean States; and France, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland for four of the five vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that, since the number of nominees endorsed by the regional groups was equal to or less than the number of vacancies, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the nominees by acclamation and to postpone to a later stage the elections for the remaining vacancies to be filled by the Groups of African, Asian, Latin American and Caribbean and Western European and other States.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said that, since no candidates had been proposed to fill the vacancies in the Groups of African, Asian, Eastern European and Latin American and Caribbean States, which had been postponed from previous sessions, he proposed that the Council should postpone those elections to a later stage as well.

It was so decided.

Committee on Crime Prevention and Control (E/1990/62 and Add.1 and 2)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 14 members of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991. The election for 14 members would take place according to the following pattern: three experts from African States; three experts from Asian States; two experts from Eastern European States; three experts from Latin American and Caribbean States; and three experts from Western European and other States.

Since in the African, Asian, Eastern European and Latin American and Caribbean Groups, the number of candidates endorsed by their Groups was equal to the number of existing vacancies, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the following by acclamation:

Albert Llewelyn Olawole Metzger (Sierra Leone)
James Barnabas Kalaila (Malawi)
Victor Ramanitra (Madagascar)
Said Bin Hillal Bin Mohammed Al-Busaidi (Oman)
Cheng Weiqiu (China)
Minoru Shikita (Japan)
Dusan Cotic (Yugoslavia)
Vasily Petrovich Ignatov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Rhadys Iris Abreu Blondet de Polanco (Dominican Republic)
Jorge Montero Castro (Costa Rica)
Benjamin Miguel-Harb (Bolivia)

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect by secret ballot three experts from the Western European and other States.

At the invitation of the President, Mrs. Suyanan (Thailand) and Mr. Klett (German Democratic Republic) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	54
<u>Number of invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	54
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	54
<u>Required majority:</u>	28
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	
Matti Joutsen (Finland)	46
Julian Jacob Ernst Schutte (Netherlands)	42
Simone Andrée Rozès (France)	38
Herman F. Woltring (Australia)	28

Having obtained the required majority and having received the largest number of votes, Matti Joutsen (Finland), Julian Jacob Ernst Schutte (Netherlands) and Simone Andrée Rozès (France) were elected members of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/1990/46 and Add.1, 2 and 3)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect nine members of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991. The number of vacancies in each geographical region was: African States, two seats; Asian States, two seats; Eastern European States, one seat; Latin American and Caribbean States, two seats; Western European and other States, two seats. The respective regional groups had endorsed the candidates nominated by the Philippines and Mongolia for the two vacancies to be filled by Asian States; by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the vacancy to be filled by an Eastern European State; by Ecuador and Mexico for the two vacancies to be filled by Latin American and Caribbean States; and by Australia and the Federal Republic of Germany for the two vacancies to be filled by the Western European and other States.

Since in the Asian, Eastern European, Latin American and Caribbean and Western European and other States Groups, the number of candidates and vacancies was equal and those candidates had been endorsed by their Groups, he took it that the Council wished to elect the following to the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, by acclamation:

Virginia Bonoan-Dandan (Philippines)

Luvсанданзангийн Идэр (Mongolia)

/...

Valeri I. Kouznetsov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Jaime Marchan Romero (Ecuador)
Javier Wimer Zambrano (Mexico)
Philip Alston (Australia)
Bruno Simma (Federal Republic of Germany)

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said that, since in the African Group there were more candidates than there were vacancies to be filled, he would invite the Council to elect by secret ballot two experts from African States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Harrison (United Kingdom) and Ms. Vargas (Nicaragua) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	54
<u>Number of invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	54
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	54
<u>Required majority:</u>	28
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	
Abdel Halim Badawi (Egypt)	37
Alexandre Muterahajuru (Rwanda)	28
C. L. C. Mubanga-Chipoya (Zambia)	26
Lwamba Katansi (Zaire)	13

Having obtained the required majority and having received the largest number of votes, Mr. Badawi (Egypt) and Mr. Muterahajuru (Rwanda) were elected members of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund (E/1990/L.7)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 10 members of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund for a three-year term beginning on 1 August 1990.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that the respective regional groups had endorsed the candidatures of Liberia and Sierra Leone for the two vacancies to be filled by African States; of India, Indonesia and Sri Lanka for the three vacancies to be filled by Asian States; of the German Democratic Republic for the vacancy to be filled by an Eastern European State; of Uruguay for the vacancy to be filled by the Latin American and Caribbean States; and of Denmark, Spain and Switzerland for the three vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that, since the number of nominees endorsed by the regional groups was equal to the number of vacancies, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the nominees by acclamation.

It was so decided.

Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes (E/1990/L.11)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect five members of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1991.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that the respective regional groups had endorsed the candidatures of Egypt for the vacancy to be filled by an African State; of Japan and Pakistan for the two vacancies to be filled by Asian States; and of Belgium and Sweden for the two vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that, since the number of nominees endorsed by the regional groups was equal to the number of vacancies, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the nominees by acclamation.

It was so decided.

Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (E/1990/47 and Add.1)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to appoint three members of the Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women to fill the vacancies that would arise on 30 June 1990. Information concerning the membership of the Board of Trustees and the names and curricula vitae of the persons nominated by States were contained in document E/1990/47 and Add.1. The candidature of Abdul Ghefar M. S. Al-Atraqhi (Iraq) had been withdrawn.

/...

(The President)

Since Pilar Escario Rodriguez-Spiteri (Spain) was the only candidate from the Western European and other States, he took it that the Council agreed to appoint her by acclamation.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect by secret ballot one member from the Group of African States and one member from the Group of Asian States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Oliyinyk (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Sandoval (Ecuador) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot to elect one member from the Group of Asian States.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	54
<u>Number of invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	54
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	54
<u>Required majority:</u>	28
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	
Amara Pongsapich (Thailand)	39
Siti Zahara Sulaiman (Malaysia)	15

Having obtained the required majority, Amara Pongsapich (Thailand) was appointed a member of the Board of Trustees for a three-year term beginning on 30 June 1990.

A vote was taken by secret ballot to elect one member from the Group of African States.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	54
<u>Number of invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	54
<u>Abstentions:</u>	1
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	53
<u>Required majority:</u>	27

Number of votes obtained:

Amsou Amadou Maiga (Niger)	22
Gertrude Ibengwe Mongella (United Republic of Tanzania)	17
Tawheeda O. Hadra (Sudan)	7
Negat Mengesha Tessema (Ethiopia)	5
Ahlonkoba Aithnard (Togo)	1
Ruth Butao Ayoade (Malawi)	1
Mahamat Senoussi Mahamat (Chad)	0

No candidate having obtained the required majority, a second vote was taken by secret ballot restricted to the two candidates having obtained the largest number of votes.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	53
<u>Number of invalid ballots:</u>	3
<u>Number of valid ballots:</u>	50
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	50
<u>Required majority:</u>	26
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	

Gertrude Ibengwe Mongella (United Republic of Tanzania)	26
Amsou Amadou Maiga (Niger)	24

Having obtained the required majority, Gertrude Ibengwe Mongella (United Republic of Tanzania) was appointed a member of the Board of Trustees for a three-year term beginning on 30 June 1990.

Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (E/1990/L.9)

The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with its resolution 2008 (LX), the Council was required to nominate 20 members for election by the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session to fill vacancies in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination which would occur at the end of 1990. The term of office was for three years beginning on 1 January 1991.

Ms. Kimball (Secretary of the Council) said that the respective regional groups had endorsed the candidatures of Burundi, the Congo, Nigeria and Uganda for the four vacancies to be filled by African States; of India, Indonesia, Iraq and Pakistan for the four vacancies to be filled by Asian States; of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Romania and the Ukrainian SSR for the three vacancies to be filled by Eastern European States; of Chile, Colombia, Mexico and Trinidad and Tobago for the four vacancies to be filled by Latin American and Caribbean States; and of the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the five vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that, in the Group of Eastern European States, the number of candidates was greater than the number of vacancies. When a similar situation had occurred in the past, the Council had decided to nominate all the candidates submitted by each Group, from whom the General Assembly would elect the appropriate number of candidates in each case. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to nominate for election by the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session all the candidates proposed.

It was so decided.

World Food Council (E/1990/L.10)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to nominate 12 members of the World Food Council for a three-year beginning on 1 January 1991.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that the respective regional groups had endorsed the candidatures of Gambia, Kenya and Lesotho for the three vacancies to be filled by African States; of Bangladesh, China and Nepal for the three vacancies to be filled by Asian States; of Bulgaria, for the one vacancy to be filled by an Eastern European State; of Colombia and Mexico for the two vacancies to be filled by the Latin American and Caribbean States and of Canada, Turkey and the United States of America for the three vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that since the number of nominees endorsed by regional groups was equal to the number of vacancies, he would take it that the Council wished to nominate all of the candidates submitted by the groups for election by the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session.

It was so decided.

/...

Elections postponed from previous sessions

The PRESIDENT asked the Council to consider the vacancy on the Population Commission for which elections had been postponed from previous sessions. There was a vacancy for one member from the African States for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1993. Since the secretariat of the Organization of African Unity had informed the Secretariat that Zambia had been endorsed by the African Group to fill the vacancy, he would take it that the Council wished to elect Zambia by acclamation.

It was so decided.

Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (E/1990/L.8)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect 16 members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme for a three-year term beginning on the first day of the organizational meeting of the Governing Council in February 1991. Information concerning the election was contained in document E/1990/L.8.

Ms. KIMBALL (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat had been informed by the secretariat of OAU that the candidatures of Ghana, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Zimbabwe had been endorsed by the African group for the three vacancies to be filled by African States and that Algeria was also a candidate for one of the vacancies for the African Group; Bangladesh, Kuwait and Papua New Guinea were candidates recommended by the Asian Group for the three vacancies to be filled by Asian States and Yugoslavia, and China and Indonesia were also candidates; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was a candidate for the vacancy to be filled by Eastern European States, and Cuba, Nicaragua and Saint Lucia were candidates for the three vacancies to be filled by Latin American and Caribbean States. The secretariat had also been informed that Mexico had withdrawn its candidature. Austria, Finland, Italy, Japan, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States of America were candidates for the six vacancies to be filled by Western European and other States.

The PRESIDENT said that since the number of candidates from the Groups of Eastern European and Latin American and Caribbean States was equal to the number of vacancies for those Groups, he would take it that the Council wished to elect the candidates by acclamation.

It was so decided.

/...

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to elect by secret ballot three members from African States, three members from Asian States and Yugoslavia, three members from Latin American and Caribbean States and six members from Western European and other States.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Klett (German Democratic Republic) and Mrs. Vargas (Nicaragua) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers: 54

Number of invalid ballots: 0

Number of valid ballots: 54

Abstentions: 0

Number of members voting: 54

Required majority: 28

Number of votes obtained:

African States

Zimbabwe 41

Ghana 39

Algeria 35

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya 35

Gambia 1

Asian States

China 42

Kuwait 34

Bangladesh 28

Indonesia 28

Papua New Guinea 24

Yugoslavia 1

Western European and other States

Finland 52

Japan 49

Italy 47

Austria 45

United States of America 44

United Kingdom	38
Turkey	27
Ireland	2

Having obtained the required majority, Zimbabwe and Ghana (Group of African States), China and Kuwait (Group of Asian States and Yugoslavia) and Finland, Japan, Italy, Austria, the United States of America and the United Kingdom (Group of Western European and other States) were elected members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme.

The PRESIDENT said that in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 70 of the rules of procedure, a special ballot would have to be held to break the tie between Algeria and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in the Group of African States, and between Bangladesh and Indonesia in the Group of Asian States and Yugoslavia.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1990/SR.12

29 May 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1990

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 12th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 23 May 1990, at 3.30 p.m.

President:

Mr. GHAREKHAN

(India)

CONTENTS

Elections, nominations and appointments (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

ELECTIONS, NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS (continued)

Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (continued)
(E/1990/L.8)

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council must elect a third member of the Governing Council from the Group of African States and a third member from the Group of Asian States, since there had been a tie in both groups at the previous meeting.

He invited the Council to proceed to a second ballot restricted to the two unsuccessful candidates from African States having obtained the largest number of votes, Algeria and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

At the invitation of the President, Ms. Vargas (Nicaragua) and Mr. Klett (German Democratic Republic) acted as tellers.

A second vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>No. of ballot papers:</u>	54
<u>No. of invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>No. of valid ballots:</u>	54
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>No. of members voting:</u>	54
<u>Required majority:</u>	28
<u>No. of votes obtained:</u>	
Algeria	34
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	20

Having obtained the required majority, Algeria was elected a member of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme for a three-year term beginning on the first day of the organizational meeting of the Governing Council in February 1991.

The PRESIDENT then invited the Council to proceed to a second ballot to elect one more member from the Group of Asian States and Yugoslavia, restricted to the two unsuccessful candidates having obtained the largest number of votes, Bangladesh and Indonesia.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Harrison (United Kingdom) and Mr. Koulik (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) acted as tellers.

A second vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>No. of ballot papers:</u>	54
<u>No. of invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>No. of valid ballots:</u>	54
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>No. of members voting:</u>	54
<u>Required majority:</u>	28
<u>No. of votes obtained:</u>	
Indonesia	29
Bangladesh	25

Having obtained the required majority, Indonesia was elected a member of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme for a three-year term beginning on the first day of the organizational meeting of the Governing Council in February 1991.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 8.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1990/SR.13

30 May 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1990

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 13th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 24 May 1990, at 10 a.m.

President:

Mr. DJOUDI

(Algeria)

CONTENTS

Advancement of women

Social development

Narcotic drugs

Human rights questions

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 4: ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (E/1990/25 and Corr.1 and Add.1; E/1990/68)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions which the Second (Social) Committee recommended for adoption, pointing out that draft resolutions I-XIII and draft decisions I and II were contained in the report of the Commission on the Status of Women (E/1990/25, chap. I), while draft resolutions XIV and XV and draft decision III were contained in the report of the Second (Social) Committee (E/1990/68).

Draft resolution I

Mrs. HELKE (United Kingdom) said that the position of her delegation was well known: while it fully supported the advancement of women, it also fully supported the prerogatives of the Secretary-General and the provisions of the Charter. Furthermore, it was the right of each Member State to nominate candidates that it considered appropriately qualified. Her delegation therefore joined the consensus only on the understanding that the Secretary-General would comply with the resolution in strict accordance with the Charter. It reserved the right to return to the issue in the appropriate forums.

Draft resolution I was adopted.

Draft resolutions II to VIII

Draft resolutions II to VIII were adopted.

Draft resolution IX

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted draft resolution IX, in a recorded vote, by 37 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

Ms. McLENNAN (United States) said that her country was well aware of the difficult situation of the Palestinian women and children. It urged that the level of confrontation should be lowered for all concerned and that the problems should be resolved through non-violent means, leading to a process of political reconciliation.

/...

(Ms. McLennan, United States)

The draft resolution presented a one-sided view of the situation and included a sweeping condemnation of Israeli policies and practices without regard to complex political and security considerations or the cycle of violence that had taken so many lives on both sides. Resolutions containing unbalanced rhetoric did not help alleviate the conditions of the women and children concerned nor did they make a practical contribution to resolving the underlying problems. Such resolutions only deepened divisions and poisoned the atmosphere. Moreover, they did nothing to ensure the legitimate political rights of the Palestinians or the security of the State of Israel.

Her Government and other interested parties were engaged in intensive efforts to promote dialogue between Israelis and Palestinians that could lead to elections in the occupied territories and in negotiated comprehensive peace. Nurturing such dialogue should remain the first priority of all those who were seriously interested in resolving the conflict.

For those reasons, her Government would vote against the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution IX.

In favour: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution IX was adopted by 39 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

Mr. SLABY (Czechoslovakia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that while his delegation supported efforts aimed at finding a just and durable solution in the Middle East and had repeatedly expressed its solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian women and its support for the right of the Palestinian people to

(Mr. Slaby, Czechoslovakia)

self-determination, it had abstained because the draft resolution dealt with some issues the substance of which was beyond the mandate of the Commission on the Status of Women. It also had reservations with respect to the wording of some of the operative paragraphs.

Mr. DUHS (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of Sweden and Finland, said that those delegations had voted in favour of the draft resolution. At the same time, they would have preferred different wording in certain paragraphs. Sweden and Finland wished to express their support for the struggle of the Palestinian women to achieve self-reliance and equality.

Mr. KOLAROV (Bulgaria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, despite the unbalanced wording of certain paragraphs, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba) said that, had his delegation been present, it would have voted in favour of resolution IX.

Mr. OUSSEINI (Niger) said that, had his delegation been present, it would have voted in favour of the resolution.

Draft resolution X

Mrs. HELKE (United Kingdom) said that her delegation wished to reiterate its concern that the Secretariat had failed to produce a document on programme budget implications of the draft resolution before action had been taken by the Commission on the Status of Women. In resolution 44/77 of 8 December 1989, the General Assembly had called for the conference to be held at the lowest possible cost. She urged the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance to comply with that request and try to identify cost-saving measures, so that the cost of the conference could be met from existing resources. She emphasized that joining consensus on the draft resolution did not imply support for the proposed level of expenditure.

Mr. DUHS (Sweden) said that document E/1990/25/Add.1 did not contain a breakdown of expenditures related to the level and composition of the Secretariat for the proposed conference. It was important to know if the proposed total expenditures included the designation of a secretary-general of the conference.

(Mr. Duhs, Sweden)

As a matter of principle, the conference should be given the same status as other world conferences on women and other comparable world conferences within the United Nations system.

Ms. McLENNAN (United States of America) expressed the hope that the conference would have the same stature as other United Nations world conferences and previous world conferences on women. However, she wished to reiterate that the conference should be held at the lowest possible cost. The \$3.2 million estimate was higher than had been anticipated and she looked forward to a more detailed explanation of how the money would be allocated.

The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

It was so decided.

Draft resolution XI

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Second (Social) Committee had adopted resolution XI, in a recorded vote, by 40 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

Ms. McLENNAN (United States of America) said that there was a consensus among the American people against apartheid and against repression and violence, whether practised by the South African Government or its opponents. The use of pressure to defeat apartheid had been an element of United States policy for many years. In the view of her delegation, the draft resolution was unbalanced. Except for the brief acknowledgement in paragraph 3, it gave no recognition to the remarkable progress that had been made in South Africa during the past year. Her country applauded the first official meeting between the South African Government and the African National Congress that had recently taken place. It was also encouraged by the decision of the South African Government to open hospitals to all races and to form a single educational system and its announcement that it was committed to the concept of majority rule. Instead of adopting resolutions such as the one currently before the Council, the United Nations should recognize the positive changes that had taken place in South Africa.

/...

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution XI.

In favour: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal.

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 41 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba) said that, had his delegation been present, it would have voted in favour of the resolution.

Draft resolution XII

Draft resolution XII was adopted.

Draft resolution XIII

Draft resolution XIII was adopted.

Ms. McLENNAN (United States of America) said that her Government reserved its position on paragraph 5 and Recommendation V. Specifically, it did not agree with the concept of "equal pay for work of equal value"; rather, it supported the principle of "equal pay for equal work".

Her Government also reserved its position on paragraphs 9 and 14, believing them to be unbalanced and fundamentally misleading. They suggested that external economic developments were the principal reasons for the adverse effects of the economic crisis upon women. In fact, poor economic performance in some developing countries had been largely the result of inappropriate domestic economic policies. Any statement on the economic problems of developing countries had to acknowledge both domestic and external causes of the economic crisis.

(Ms. McLennan, United States)

Some developing countries with the largest economies and populations had shown substantial increases in economic growth. Paragraphs 9 and 14 should be more specifically addressed to countries in Africa and Latin America where economic problems might have given rise to a decline in the economic well-being for most women.

The language referring to adjustment policies suggested that such policies were part of the problem for women in development. In the view of her delegation, such policies, if fully implemented, were part of the solution of low growth in developing countries and would ultimately benefit all women.

The shift of resources to export-oriented farmers had not deprived rural women of vital resources. Rather, imperfect linkages in the economies of developing countries had prevented increased exports from being translated into higher rural incomes.

Her Government reserved its position on paragraph 21 and Recommendation XIX. It believed that disarmament and development were distinct issues that needed to be considered separately and on their respective merits.

With respect to Recommendation XXII, her Government believed that the studies envisioned therein must not lead to censorship or other restrictions on the freedom of expression guaranteed by several international instruments as well as the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Draft resolutions XIV and XV

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolutions XIV and XV which were contained in document E/1990/68.

Draft resolutions XIV and XV were adopted.

Draft decision I

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision I, the texts of which were contained in document E/1990/25.

Draft decision I was adopted.

Draft decision II

Draft decision II was adopted.

Mr. DUHS (Sweden) pointed out that, within draft decision II, the Commission on the Status of Women was bringing to the Council's attention a number of resolutions adopted by the Commission, and that resolution 34/7, which his

/...

(Mr. Duhs, Sweden)

delegation had co-sponsored, was not accurately reflected in the summary statement on page 3 of the Commission's report (E/1990/25). His delegation wished to see the correct wording of the resolution expressed in the summary.

Ms. McLENNAN (United States of America) said that in the Commission on the Status of Women her delegation had abstained in the vote on resolution 34/5 because the third preambular paragraph seemed to imply that structural adjustment programmes had a negative impact on the status of women. In the view of her Government, such programmes held the promise for advancing the status of women by increasing the prospects for foreign investment, lower inflation and increased domestic savings. Her Government also disagreed with paragraph 10 of the resolution: it believed that disarmament and development were distinct issues that must be considered separately and on their respective merits.

Draft decision III

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision III the text of which appeared in document E/1990/68.

Draft decision III was adopted.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT (E/1990/31, E/1990/69 and Add.1)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the 11 draft resolutions which the Second (Social) Committee recommended for adoption in paragraph 38 of its report (E/1969/69 and Add.1). He pointed out that the texts of draft resolutions I-V and VII were contained in the report of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control (E/1990/31).

Draft resolutions I-V

Draft resolutions I to V were adopted.

Draft resolution VI

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution VI, the text of which appeared in document E/1990/69.

Draft resolution VI was adopted.

Mrs. HELKE (United Kingdom) said that the Council's decision in paragraph 12 to transmit to the Eighth Congress the draft resolutions recommended by the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control at its eleventh session did not constitute an endorsement of the draft resolutions. Any decisions taken at the Eighth Congress would have to be considered in the context of the overall level of available resources and subject to decisions on relative priorities.

/...

Ms. McLENNAN (United States of America) expressed full agreement with that statement. The United States had joined in the Council's adoption of the resolution without a vote but that did not constitute an expression of any view or position on the draft recommendations being transmitted to the Congress, which the United States would not be attending for reasons it had clearly expressed in the Council in 1989. The United States regretted that it would not be taking part because it strongly supported the work of the United Nations in the field of crime prevention.

Draft resolution VII

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution VII, the text of which appeared in document E/1990/31.

Draft resolution VII was adopted.

Draft resolution VIII

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution VIII, which appeared in document E/1990/69.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted.

Draft resolution IX

Mr. STUART (Observer for Australia) said that if the Commission for Social Development decided to establish the ad hoc open-ended working group of government experts, referred to in operative paragraph 1, it was important to take fully into account the work being done to develop international standards elsewhere in the United Nations, in particular in the working group of the Commission on Human Rights, which had been preparing draft principles and guidelines for the protection of mentally ill persons and the improvement of mental health care.

Draft resolution IX was adopted.

Mr. KOENIG (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his Government supported the basic idea behind the resolution, to improve the situation of a particularly vulnerable group in society, namely the disabled. His delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, but would have welcomed a more comprehensive approach. In particular, it would be useful to review the mechanisms that already existed before elaborating new, additional standard rules,

(Mr. Koenig, Federal Republic of Germany)

and his Government hoped that the time frame for the elaboration of standard rules by the ad hoc open-ended working group of government experts would be sufficient to allow for thorough consideration of what would be a most important instrument.

Draft resolution X

Draft resolution X was adopted.

Draft resolution XI

Draft resolution XI was adopted.

Ms. McLENNAN (United States of America) said that the United States welcomed the progress made in linking social and economic conditions in a constructive manner demonstrated in the supplement to the 1989 Report on the World Social Situation. The United States considered the supplement to be balanced, and had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution in order to advance the work of the Council. However, her delegation did not believe that the continuous preparation of such reports was justified or would in the long run contribute significantly to the search for solutions to the world social problem, and the United States was neither reversing nor modifying the position it had taken at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly in its vote on resolution 44/56.

Draft decision

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft decision recommended for adoption in paragraph 39 of the report of the Second (Social) Committee, the text of which appeared on page 21 of document E/1990/31 and said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the draft decision without a vote.

It was so decided.

Membership in the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute

The PRESIDENT drew attention to decision 11/101 of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control (E/1990/31, p. 24) and said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to endorse the candidates listed therein for membership in the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute.

It was so decided.

Draft resolution XII

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution XII contained in document E/1990/69/Add.1.

Mr. AL-SAUD (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation had not participated in preparation of draft resolution XII. He reaffirmed the position stated by his country in the Committee.

Mr. AL-FAIHANI (Bahrain) reaffirmed that his country would not be participating in any action on the basis of the draft resolution, as had been stated already in the Committee.

Mr. HUSSEIN (Iraq) reaffirmed that his delegation had taken no part in the adoption of the draft resolution, and had already explained its views on the subject.

Mr. KHEIR (Jordan) said that his delegation was not able to approve of the motives that lay behind the draft resolution. Jordan was committed to the defence of human rights but objected to the abolition of capital punishment on religious grounds: the draft resolution was contrary to the instructions of Islam. However, the fact that capital punishment existed in a religion did not mean that it was applied, and many years could pass without crimes being committed that warranted capital punishment. Jordan had not requested a vote on the draft resolution because it did not wish to prevent it being adopted by consensus.

Mr. QURESHI (Pakistan) said that his delegation had also joined the consensus, but he wished to reiterate that under the Constitution of Pakistan laws which were repugnant to the spirit of Islam did not find a place in the jurisprudence of his country.

Mr. KHOSHROO (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that since his country's judicial system was based on Islamic principles his delegation would be taking no part in the action on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution XII was adopted.

NARCOTIC DRUGS (E/1990/24 and E/1990/67)

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the four draft resolutions which the Second (Social) Committee recommended for adoption in paragraph 19 of its report (E/1990/67).

Draft resolution I

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution I, the text of which appeared in document E/1990/67.

Draft resolution I was adopted.

Draft resolutions II-IV

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolutions II to IV, the texts of which appeared in document E/1990/24.

Draft resolutions II to IV were adopted.

Draft decision I

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision I the text of which appeared in document E/1990/24.

Draft decision I was adopted.

Draft decision II

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision II the text of which appeared in document E/1990/24.

Draft decision II was adopted.

Mr. AL-FAIHANI (Bahrain) thanked the Council, especially the Arab States, for supporting his Government's application for membership in the Sub-Commission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East.

Draft decisions III and IV

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decisions III and IV, which appeared in document E/1990/67.

Draft decisions III and IV were adopted.

HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (E/1990/L.26)

The PRESIDENT recalled that at its 18th meeting, on 22 May, the Second (Social) Committee, following a statement by the observer for Bolivia, on behalf of the Group of 77, had decided to refer the question of the "Enlargement of the Commission on Human Rights" to the Council for consideration in plenary. If he heard no objection he would take it that the Council wished to consider that question in plenary.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT invited the observer for Bolivia to introduce, on behalf of the Group of 77, the draft resolution contained in document E/1990/L.26.

Mr. NAVAJAS-MOGRO (Observer for Bolivia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the draft resolution entitled "Enlargement of the Commission on Human Rights and the further promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms", contained in document E/1990/L.26, was in response to the mandate given to the Council by the General Assembly in resolution 44/167 to take the necessary measures to increase the number of members of the Commission on Human Rights on the basis of equitable geographical distribution in order to improve the defence and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The draft resolution proposed that the membership of the Commission on Human Rights be increased from 43 to 53, and that the 10 additional member countries should be distributed among the regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean according to the principle of equitable geographical distribution. The election of the 10 new members would take place during the first regular session of the Council in 1991 so that the Commission, in its enlarged form, could begin its work as of its forty-eighth session in 1992. The draft resolution also authorized the Commission to meet on an exceptional basis if requested to do so by the majority of its members.

The draft resolution proposed that the period of office of Special Rapporteurs and Working Groups of the Commission should be three years and that the Bureau of the Commission should meet at the conclusion of the regular session to deal with organizational matters.

Finally, the Secretary-General was requested to submit a report on the possible organizational implications of the resolution to the Council for consideration at its first regular session in 1991.

Because of the importance of the subject it was hoped that the draft resolution would be approved by consensus. Finally, he drew attention to a typographical error in the English text in the ninth preambular paragraph.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1990/SR.14

31 May 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1990

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 14th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 25 May 1990, at 10 a.m.

President:

Mr. GHAREKHAN

(India)

CONTENTS

Human rights questions (continued)

Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism
and Racial Discrimination (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Draft resolutions II to IX

Draft resolutions II to IX were adopted.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft decisions which the Second (Social) Committee had recommended for adoption. The texts of draft decisions I-IV, VI-XVIII, XX-XXVI and XXVIII and XXIX were contained in the report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/1990/22, chap. I). The texts of draft decisions V, XIX and XXVII were contained in paragraph 62 of the report of the Second (Social) Committee (E/1990/70).

Draft decision I had been adopted by the Second (Social) Committee, in a recorded vote, by 33 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision I.

In favour: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Canada, Japan, United States of America.

Abstaining: Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft decision I was adopted by 38 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions.

Draft decision II

The PRESIDENT noted that draft decision II had been adopted by the Second (Social) Committee, in a recorded vote, by 34 to 1, with 13 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision II.

In favour: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi

/...

Arabia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft decision II was adopted by 39 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

Draft decision III

Draft decision III was adopted.

Mr. MOORE (United States of America) said that the United States had not participated in the Council's adoption of the procedural decision on the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

Draft decision IV

Draft decision IV was adopted.

Mr. MOORE (United States of America) said that the United States had not participated in the Council's adoption of the procedural decision on the right to development.

Draft decisions V to XXIII

Draft decisions V to XXIII were adopted.

Draft decision XXIV

Draft decision XXIV was adopted.

Mr. WALDROP (United States of America) said that the United States had not participated in the Council's adoption of the procedural decision which provided for the circulation of a study on achievements made and obstacles encountered during the two Decades to combat racism and racial discrimination.

Draft decisions XXV to XXIX

Draft decisions XXV to XXIX were adopted.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the five additional draft resolutions, designated as draft resolutions X to XIV, which the Second (Social) Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption. The texts of the draft resolutions were contained in document E/1990/70/Add.1, paragraph 30.

/...

Draft resolutions X to XIV

Draft resolutions X to XIV were adopted.

Mr. RAVEN (United Kingdom), speaking on draft resolution XIV and draft decision V, said there could be no doubting his delegation's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights, and the importance it continued to attach to the role of the United Nations in that area. The work-load of the Centre for Human Rights had indeed increased, but when allocating scarce resources the United Nations must apply the same rigorous standards to all its programmes of activity. The Centre's resources derived from extrabudgetary, voluntary and regular budget funding, and there had been an increasingly serious shortfall in financing the regular budget through payment of assessed contributions. Nevertheless, his delegation had joined the consensus, although it wondered to what extent it was a matter for the Secretary-General to find a solution to the problems that existed.

The report to which the draft resolution was a response was welcome in that it implied increased readiness by the Secretariat to allocate staff and other resources on the basis of objective techniques of work-load analysis. However, in some respects it was difficult to reconcile with, for example, the introduction to the proposed programme budget for the current biennium and the analytical report on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/213. Those documents should be taken into account when considering the question. He noted that accumulated arrears to the regular budget had reached \$US 900 million. Although the human rights programme deserved higher priority, no case could be made for any net increase in the overall level of the budget until it was demonstrated that existing resources were being efficiently and effectively deployed. Some progress had been made in that direction but much remained to be done.

On the computerization of the work of human rights treaty-monitoring bodies (draft decision V), his delegation had already made clear that budgetary provision for computer operating costs was a matter for the competent organs of the United Nations, and it attached particular importance to the expert scrutiny by ACABQ of any proposals which the Secretary-General might put to the General Assembly. Only in the light of ACABQ's intention to monitor the breakdown of costs paid from the regular budget and from extrabudgetary funds, including those regarding

(Mr. Raven, United Kingdom)

administration and backstopping, endorsed in General Assembly resolution 44/200, would the General Assembly be able to take a final decision on the matter.

Mr. MOORE (United States of America) noted that in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the Secretary-General was requested to develop long-term solutions to resource problems affecting the Centre for Human Rights and to include those measures in his programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993. The programme budget would also have to incorporate measures to compensate effectively for the extra strain on resources caused by an increase in the number of States members of the Commission on Human Rights.

Draft decisions XXX and XXXI

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decisions XXX and XXXI, the texts of which were contained in the report of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights on its fourth session (E/1990/23).

Draft decision XXX

Draft decision XXX was adopted.

Draft decision XXXI

Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Council) said that if the Council decided to adopt draft decision XXXI, thereby approving the suggestion that the pre-sessional working group of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights should meet one to three months prior to the session of the Committee, instead of immediately prior to the session as at present, additional costs would be required to cover the travel expenditure of the five members of the Working Group. Those additional costs were estimated at \$US 9,000. However, the Secretary-General wished to advise the Council that the additional cost would be absorbed.

Draft decision XXXI was adopted.

Draft decision XXXII

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft decision XXXII, the text of which was contained in document E/1990/70/Add.1.

Mr. ZAMORA RODRIGUEZ (Cuba) said that while it would vote in favour of the Council's decision to take note of the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its forty-sixth session (E/1990/22), Cuba categorically rejected Commission resolution 1990/48 on the situation of human rights in Cuba. Cuba would completely disregard the resolution which was fuelled by slander and lies and had nothing to

/...

(Mr. Zamora Rodriguez, Cuba)

do with human rights. It had been conceived and fabricated by the Government of the United States which had sought to impose it through pressure, bribery and deceit. It was one of a long series of acts of aggression perpetrated by the United States against the Cuban people over more than 30 years.

The resolution sought to censure the Cuban revolution which had freed the Cuban people from oppression and the violations of the past, and also from hunger, ignorance, lack of health care, backwardness, corruption and racial discrimination. Cuba stood united in defence of its independence and its revolution.

While the United States had been seeking to impose its will on the Commission on Human Rights, Cuba had steadfastly maintained its position in defence of the principles that should govern that body. In 1988 a mission from the Commission on Human Rights, made up of representatives from all regional groups, had been given the opportunity to observe the situation of human rights in Cuba, and its report had confirmed that there was no such situation that would justify special procedures, such as resolution 1990/48. That resolution called upon the Government of Cuba to honour its guarantees to the mission that individuals who attempted to present information to it would not be subject to reprisals, detention or negative consequences of any nature whatsoever. That guarantee had been provided and completely fulfilled; no person had been persecuted or detained because he or she had come into contact with the mission, but that did not mean that the Government of Cuba had given a certificate of permanent impunity and immunity to those individuals. Twenty or so of the more than 1,600 people interviewed by the mission had subsequently violated Cuban laws.

Annex III of the report of the mission, which included information sent to Geneva by counter-revolutionary groups and others about events that had not been observed by the mission, departed from the terms of Commission decision 1988/106. The mission acknowledged that that information had been sent to the Government of Cuba for comment. The Government of Cuba had provided certain information, but a number of questions appearing in annex XVI called into question the constitutional and legal bases of the Cuban State, and they had not been answered because it was the view of the Government of Cuba that it was inadmissible to discuss the Constitution and the laws of the country other than with the people of the country

/...

(Mr. Zamora Rodriguez, Cuba)

concerned. The legal institutions of Cuba were as legitimate as those of any other State, and could not be the subject of debate.

No nation in history had committed as many crimes against the people of another country as the United States, and few nations had such a long record of gross violations of the most elementary human rights within their own borders. Racism and racial discrimination were practised in the United States against various sections of the population who enjoyed neither luxury nor affluence and were condemned to poverty, unemployment, misery, lack of health care and the desperation of the slums. They were condemned to living conditions comparable to those of the most backward developing countries, but when they tried to assert their right to a better life they encountered bullets, violence and a cruel and degrading system of imprisonment.

While the United States was levelling accusations against Cuba, it was defending, in the Commission on Human Rights, the genocide perpetrated against the Palestinians, the racist apartheid régime, the use of mercenaries as a means of crushing the right of people to self-determination, and its own aggression against the Panamanian people. Its policy of duplicity was part and parcel of the aggressive, chauvinistic and opportunistic policy of the United States, which had compelled the Security Council to meet in Geneva, thereby making it waste time in putting an end to the murder by the Zionist régime of women, children and the elderly in Palestine.

The Americans set themselves up as champions of human rights, but in fact the United States applied a double standard, judging its own actions by one standard and those of other countries by another.

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to include the draft provisional agenda for the forty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights, contained in the report of the Commission, in the text of draft decision XXXII, and proposed that it should take note of the report of the Commission (E/1990/22) and approve the draft provisional agenda for the forty-seventh session of the Commission. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council adopted draft decision XXXII, as orally amended.

Draft decision XXXII, as orally amended, was adopted.

Draft decisions XXXIII and XXXIV

Draft decisions XXXIII and XXXIV were adopted.

/...

Mr. MOORE (United States of America), speaking on draft resolution XXXIV, said that his delegation had joined the consensus on a purely procedural decision that called upon the Secretary-General to prepare a report containing the comments of Governments on the situation in southern Lebanon. The United States remained deeply concerned about the situation in the whole of Lebanon, including its southern portion, and believed that it was essential for foreign forces to be withdrawn from the entire country. Resolution 1990/54 of the Commission on Human Rights was not conducive to the creation of conditions that would permit such a withdrawal of forces; it was unbalanced and inflammatory, and failed to take account of the complex situation that confronted the Lebanese people, in part because of the presence of foreign troops other than those of Israel. For those reasons the United States had voted against it, and continued to reject and to dissociate itself from it.

Draft decision XXXV

The PRESIDENT said that the draft decision had been adopted by the Second (Social) Committee, in a recorded vote, by 31 to 4, with 15 abstentions, and he took it that the Council wished to vote on the draft decision. He invited any delegation wishing to make a statement before the vote to do so.

Ms. DINH THI MINH HUYEN (Observer for Viet Nam) said that the draft decision ignored developments in Cambodia over the past 10 years, deliberately failing to acknowledge Viet Nam's total troop withdrawal from that country and trying to create confusion by referring to subsequent reports of foreign forces having returned to Cambodia.

Viet Nam's total troop withdrawal had helped to settle one of the two key issues in an overall political solution; the remaining one was to prevent the Khmer Rouge reinstating its genocidal régime in Cambodia. The draft decision made no mention of the heinous crimes of the Khmer Rouge régime, thereby paving the way for that régime's return to power.

The draft decision also made no mention of the human rights abuses committed by the Khmer Rouge against Cambodians living in the refugee camps along the border with Thailand. By referring to them as resulting from foreign armed intervention and occupation the draft decision created confusion.

(Ms. Dinh Thi Minh Huyen, Observer, Viet Nam)

Some countries were making every effort to use the United Nations decision to justify their continued supply of military aid to the Khmer Rouge to wage a civil war against the Cambodian people's right to self-determination, and to obstruct early achievement of a comprehensive political solution to the problem of Cambodia. More and more countries were expressing support for the conclusions of the Paris Conference on Cambodia, and the decision by the States members of the European Community to oppose the granting of a seat in the United Nations to the coalition Government in exile led by Prince Sihanouk because it included the Khmer Rouge would undoubtedly contribute to the search for an early solution.

Viet Nam fully supported the just stance of the State of Cambodia, and sought an early overall political solution, but considered that following the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops all countries concerned had to fulfil their commitment to stop military supplies to all the Khmer parties, to expedite a cease-fire, end the civil war, encourage the representatives of the two Governments in Cambodia to continue their negotiations, and continue efforts to maintain the process of the Paris Conference on Cambodia with a view to early achievement of an overall political solution. The Cambodian people must have a chance to exercise their right to self-determination, and all internal affairs of Cambodia must be solved by the Cambodians themselves. The negotiations between the two parties in Cambodia were continuing and the Council should make a positive contribution and not take any action that hindered the process.

Ms. CHAN (Observer for Singapore), noting that the Observer for Viet Nam had accused the co-sponsors of the draft decision, of which Singapore was one, of failing to acknowledge its total troop withdrawal from Cambodia, said that there had been reports in Jane's Defence Weekly in February and March 1990, from correspondents in Cambodia, quoting Vietnamese deserters who had confirmed that they had been fighting in Cambodia since September 1989. An academic at Harvard University, who was writing a book on Cambodia, had said that one month after the reported Vietnamese troop withdrawal morale had crumbled and Vietnamese elite forces had been sent back into Cambodia. The Phnom Penh régime was clearly unable on its own to prevent the return of the Khmer Rouge, and the Council should express its concern that the Cambodian people should be allowed the right to self-determination.

/...

Ms. CHENG (Observer for Cambodia) said that the fact that the Council would be adopting by an overwhelming majority a draft decision calling for the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Cambodia, with effective supervision and verification by the United Nations, and calling for respect of the rights of the Cambodian people to self-determination through free, fair and democratic elections under direct United Nations administration was of special significance in view of the efforts on the part of Viet Nam to shift the focus from its aggression and occupation to the so-called threat of the Khmer Rouge returning to power.

Viet Nam had claimed that since September 1989 there were no Vietnamese armed forces left in Cambodia, but the highly publicized "troop withdrawal" was merely a ploy aimed at persuading the world community to pay for Viet Nam's continued occupation of Cambodia. There had been reports of the active participation of Vietnamese forces in combat operations, intelligence and command and control activities in Cambodia in various newspapers and in a report prepared by a task force on terrorism and unconventional warfare of the United States House of Representatives as recently as April 1990. Some reports put the number of Vietnamese forces in Cambodia as high as 66,000. They were disguising themselves as soldiers of the régime they had installed in Phnom Penh in order to persuade people that the conflict in Cambodia was a civil war. That was the main reason why Viet Nam and the Phnom Penh régime were having difficulties in accepting an effective United Nations presence in Cambodia to supervise and verify the troop withdrawal and to conduct and supervise free, fair and democratic elections.

Another aim of Viet Nam's propaganda was to bring the issue of a return to power by the Khmer Rouge to the forefront, and it was ironic that after more than 11 years of dismissing the Cambodian resistance as ineffective, Viet Nam had boosted the strength of the resistance, in particular the Khmer Rouge, by brandishing the threat of their return to power by military means. Viet Nam hoped that its propaganda would erode international concern over its military occupation and enable it to convince the world community to pay for its continued annexation of Cambodia. An affirmative vote on the draft decision might not produce immediate results but it would send a clear message to Viet Nam that the world community could not be deceived and was committed to upholding the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law.

/...

Mr. VAN WULFFTEN PALTHE (Netherlands), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation would abstain because it considered that the draft decision did not adequately reflect recent developments. He regretted that the negotiations had not yielded a text that met his delegation's concerns. His delegation fully subscribed to the concerns indicated to the co-sponsors of the draft decision at an early stage by the States members of the European Community. The non-return to power by the Khmer Rouge remained a central element of Community and Netherlands policy on Cambodia. He expressed the hope that negotiations during the forthcoming session of the General Assembly would have a more satisfactory outcome.

A recorded vote was taken on draft decision XXXV.

- In favour: Bahamas, Bahrain, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Mexico, Niger, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.
- Against: Cuba, India, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
- Abstaining: Algeria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Lesotho, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft decision XXXV was adopted by 30 votes to 4, with 18 abstentions.

Mr. TRAXLER (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation fully supported all constructive efforts to find a comprehensive, just and lasting political solution to the situation in Cambodia. However, the decision just adopted by the Council did not address all of the issues which must be taken into account. His delegation supported a comprehensive political settlement which must ensure the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and neutrality of Cambodia, as well as the fundamental rights of Cambodians to choose their own Government in free, fair and internationally supervised elections. It totally rejected the genocidal policies of the Pol Pot Khmer Rouge. While stressing the

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

need for all groups concerned to respect the results of free elections, it strongly believed that those responsible for the extermination of hundreds of thousands of Cambodians should be prevented from returning to power. It also believed that proposals aiming at the establishment of impartial administrations in the refugee camps should be carefully studied. As the decision just adopted did not fully reflect those concerns nor take account of recent developments, his delegation had been unable to support it. Its abstention should be seen as an encouragement to all parties concerned to adopt a more constructive approach.

Ms. DIEGUEZ-ARMAS (Mexico), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft decision XXXV because it reflected some of the central concerns of the international community on the question of Cambodia, especially the need to achieve a comprehensive political settlement that would allow the Cambodian people to exercise their right of self-determination. She was sure that an agreement such as the one provided for would guarantee the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of Cambodia. The draft decision also reflected the international community's unambiguous rejection of any return to power on the part of those who had perpetrated genocidal crimes against the people of Cambodia.

However, her delegation had some reservations with regard to certain parts of the text. A more balanced text would have contributed more to the political process aimed at ensuring that all parties concerned reached an understanding that would benefit the people of Cambodia. In the absence of a comprehensive political settlement, there was no mandate as to the form which a possible participation of the United Nations in the process might take. The text which had just been adopted took for granted the existence of agreements concerning a possible role of the United Nations whereas, in fact, there were no such agreements. At the same time, it was clear that, although the instability prevailing in Cambodia gave rise to problems such as that of refugees in neighbouring countries, the situation was not exclusively attributable to foreign intervention and occupation. Finally, her delegation was concerned that the decision attempted to set out guidelines for the Government of Cambodia elected in a free and just process. It was not right to set pre-conditions for the self-determination of the Cambodian people.

/...

Ms. COOMBS (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation's abstention on the decision did not diminish its support for efforts to find a political solution that would enable the Cambodian people to live in peace. Unfortunately, the draft decision just adopted did not condemn the invasion of Cambodia by foreign forces. Her delegation wished to reiterate that any return to power by those responsible for serious human rights violations was unthinkable.

Mr. HAYES (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained because the draft decision was unbalanced, as it did not take into account the new situation resulting from the withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Cambodia. Moreover, it was essential to stress the responsibility of all members of the international community to prevent the genocidal Pol Pot régime from returning to power in Cambodia, and the absence of any reference to that in the draft decision was unacceptable. His delegation welcomed the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops, but called for official verification of the situation in that regard, as well as for an immediate cease-fire and the cessation of all external military support to belligerents. It supported an enhanced role for the United Nations in efforts to find a solution to the Cambodian problem. It had noted with satisfaction the talks held by the five permanent members of the Security Council, and hoped that the next round of talks would lead to a balanced solution.

Mr. WHITAKER-SALES (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision, although it felt that some of its language went beyond the mandate of the Economic and Social Council and would have better been taken up in the General Assembly or the Security Council.

Allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1989/82, paragraph 9

The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to a note by the Secretary-General on allegations regarding infringements of trade union rights: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1989/82, paragraph 9, transmitting a letter from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of South Africa (E/1990/87/Add.2). Since the note had been issued after the conclusion of the work of the Social Committee, he said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to take note of it.

It was so decided.

Draft resolution E/1990/L.26

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution E/1990/L.26, entitled "Enlargement of the Commission on Human Rights and the further promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms", pointing out that in the ninth preambular paragraph, the word "Rapporteur" should read "Rapporteurs". A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution had been issued in document E/1990/L.27.

A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution E/1990/L.26.

In favour: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

Draft resolution E/1990/L.26 was adopted by 53 votes to 1.

Ms. DU YONG (China), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which reflected her delegation's desire to redress the imbalance in the distribution of States in the Commission on Human Rights. However, her affirmative vote should not be construed as acceptance of all the provisions of the draft resolution, especially paragraph 3. The question of improving the functioning of the Commission on Human Rights should be discussed in the Commission itself. A Working Group had already been established for that purpose.

Mr. MOORE (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation understood both the benefits and the liabilities of enlarging the Commission. Expansion could bring about increased participation in

/...

(Mr. Moore, United States)

the Commission's important work, but could also limit the Commission's ability to conduct its work effectively. An enlarged Commission would cost considerably more, and all Members of the United Nations would have to pay the bill.

His delegation appreciated the serious consultations and good-faith efforts undertaken by the sponsors of the draft resolution; it had also endeavoured to reach a consensus. It had sought to temper its reservations about enlargement by suggesting that a new operative paragraph should be inserted to read as follows:

"Strongly urges the Commission on Human Rights, in view of its special responsibilities under the Charter and its authority to examine violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in any part of the world, to take action on the merits of each proposal on such questions, and suggests that it consider, in appropriate cases, voting by secret ballot."

The paragraph proposed by his delegation was significant and substantive, and its adoption would have attested to acceptance by the international community of the principle that the Commission's essential work should continue unimpaired, in spite of the inevitable strains which enlargement would cause. But the sponsors of the draft resolution had been unwilling to commit themselves, and the United States therefore remained concerned about the consequences of enlargement.

The resolution did, however, contain provisions for a number of enhancements which the United States considered positive and helpful, namely, the emphasis on the importance of ongoing efforts to improve the functioning of the Commission (sixth and tenth preambular paragraphs), authorization for the Commission to meet exceptionally between its regular sessions (para. 3), strengthened mandates for Special Rapporteurs and working groups charged with studying and reporting on world-wide principles related to human rights (para. 4) and a post-sessional role for the Commission's Bureau in formulating suggestions for improving the Commission's organization of work (para. 5).

The United States would contribute constructively to the ongoing deliberations on enhancement during the Commission's session in Geneva in early 1991. It considered it important to find ways to improve and reform the activities of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and believed that the Commission should simplify and strengthen the confidential procedures instituted under Economic and Social Council resolution 1503 (XLVIII),

/...

(Mr. Moore, United States)

so as to be more effective in dealing with a "consistent pattern of violations" in any particular country, as revealed by the accumulated complaints of many individuals.

His delegation was encouraged by the sense that there was a stronger commitment within the international community to respecting and promoting the human rights and standing of individuals in countries throughout the world. It anticipated that the candidates put forward in 1991 for election to the Commission on Human Rights would show strong devotion to the common goals of the international community and that that spirit of commitment would extend to all those who would have greater opportunities to participate in the work of the Commission.

Mr. SEZAKI (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, even though it contained elements that were far from satisfactory, because, as an Asian country, it wished to show its solidarity with other members of the Asian group.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE SECOND DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (E/1990/L.22)

Draft resolution E/1990/L.22

Mr. KANE (Observer for Mauritania), speaking on behalf of the African States, said he first wished to express their satisfaction at the independence of Namibia and the release of Nelson Mandela. They also welcomed the recent Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa, unanimously adopted by the General Assembly at its sixteenth special session. In that historic document, the international community had been invited to maintain existing measures against South Africa until there was clear evidence of profound and irreversible changes. Despite recent developments, it was clear that the practice of apartheid in South Africa was still very much alive. In keeping with the spirit of the Declaration, the African countries sponsoring draft resolution E/1990/L.22 had held extensive consultations on the wording of the text. In an effort to maintain unity, they wished to propose that the eleventh preambular paragraph should be reworded as follows:

"Noting with deep concern that the official invitation being extended to the President of South Africa by some countries could be construed to mean the relaxation of pressure against the apartheid régime."

/...

(Mr. Kane, Observer, Mauritania)

With that new formulation, the African States hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus. If that was not the case, he invited the Council to consider the resolution as a whole, without a separate vote.

Mr. HAYES (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, requested a separate vote on the eleventh preambular paragraph and a vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

At the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on the eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution E/1990/L.22.

In favour: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Japan, New Zealand, Sweden.

The eleventh preambular paragraph, as orally revised, was adopted by 36 votes to 8, with 7 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution E/1990/L.22 as a whole.

In favour: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution E/1990/L.22, as orally revised, was adopted as a whole by 42 votes to 0, with 10 abstentions.

Mr. HAYES (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the States members of the European Community, said that the European Community had been unable to support the adoption of draft resolution E/1990/L.22 without a vote because of the oral amendment to the eleventh preambular paragraph, which presented the international community's efforts to promote the eradication of apartheid in an unfair light. The European Community had repeatedly condemned racial discrimination in all its forms and was committed to the establishment of a democratic, united and non-racial South Africa in which all South Africans would enjoy equal rights.

Mr. MOORE (United States of America) said that the United States had not participated in the voting on draft resolution E/1990/L.22. His delegation had ceased to participate in any debate on or adoption of resolutions relating to the First Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in 1975, when the General Assembly had adopted resolution 3379 (XXX) which, in effect, equated zionism with racism. That resolution had tainted the First Decade and continued to taint the Second.

The United States was committed to the eradication of apartheid and to the promotion of fundamental political change leading to a non-racial, democratic South Africa. It enforced fully its sanctions against that country and was increasing its assistance to black South Africans. The United States was actively engaged in diplomatic efforts to resolve conflicts and to support economic development throughout southern Africa and was conducting intensive consultations with other nations, especially South Africa's major trading partners and the front-line States, on the problems and issues facing southern Africa.

The internal and external pressure on South African whites to accept fundamental change appeared to be bearing fruit. His delegation applauded the historic first official meeting of the South African Government and the African National Congress at Cape Town from 2 to 4 May 1990. The United States was

(Mr. Moore, United States)

encouraged by the South African Government's announcement that public hospitals would be open to people of all races, and that South Africa was prepared to discuss a single educational system for all South Africans. The international community must continue to encourage those positive trends towards dismantling apartheid.

Mr. STANEVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, while his delegation had voted in favour of both draft resolution E/1990/L.22 as a whole and the eleventh preambular paragraph, it regretted that the Council had not been able to adopt that very important resolution by consensus.

Mr. CHABALA (Zambia) said that Zambia was surprised that some delegations had waited until the current meeting to voice their concerns about the resolution which had just been adopted because those same delegations had never bothered to express such concerns when the resolution had been in draft form.

The round of high-level visits of the President of South Africa must be seen in its correct political and diplomatic context, since it lent a veneer of credibility and legality to the racist régime. If the trend to relax the ban on contacts with the South African racist régime was not checked, the international community ran the risk of aborting the negotiations on the elimination of the apartheid system. The international community must keep the apartheid leaders at the negotiating table until fundamental political change was irreversibly secured and, at the same time, must encourage dialogue and help the oppressed majority in South Africa strengthen its negotiating resources.

In its current form and content, the resolution on the implementation of the Programme of Action of the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was in keeping with the evolving situation in South Africa and the external factors affecting it.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.



Economic and Social Council

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

E/1990/SR.15

30 May 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1990

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 15th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 25 May 1990, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. GHAREKHAN

(India)

CONTENTS

Consideration of the provisional agenda for the second regular session of 1990

Closure of the session

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE SECOND REGULAR SESSION OF 1990
(E/1990/89; E/1990/L.25)

Mr. STORY (Secretary of the Council) drew the Council's attention to document E/1990/L.25, containing the draft provisional agenda and proposed organization of work for the second regular session of 1990, and said that various revisions were necessary in the light of decisions taken by the Council since the issuance of the document. In adopting draft resolution 12 (E/1990/L.69/Add.1) on capital punishment, the Council had requested the Secretary-General, in paragraph 4, to submit to the Council at its second regular session of 1990 a revised version of the fourth quinquennial report on capital punishment for its consideration. The secretariat proposed that the report in question should be considered under draft agenda item 1 and that it should be taken up on the morning of Tuesday, 17 July, with document E/1990/L.25, (p. 10) being revised accordingly. Also, a new item 16 entitled "Elections and appointments" needed to be added to the draft provisional agenda (E/1990/L.25, p. 4) to allow for consideration of held-over election matters.

Lastly, in connection with draft agenda item 15, on the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, it should be noted that, as stated in footnote 2 (E/1990/L.25, p. 4), the report in question was normally transmitted to the General Assembly without debate unless the Council decided otherwise. The agenda item had, however, been included as a matter of course and time had been allotted for possible consideration of the report on the morning of Tuesday, 17 July (E/1990/L.25, p. 10). If the Council decided to agree to the Philippine proposal on a related issue, as contained in document E/1990/89, there would therefore be an opportunity to discuss both the report and related matters.

Mr. MENDEZ (Observer for the Philippines) drew attention to his Government's request in document E/1990/89 that the Council should discuss the membership of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees under agenda item 15 at its second regular session. The request was prompted by the need to allow countries like the Philippines that were countries of first asylum for the growing numbers of Indo-Chinese refugees in the South-East Asian region - and thus deeply involved in the search for a solution to that serious humanitarian problem - to be represented on the Executive Committee in order to participate directly in the High Commissioner's activities and programmes. He hoped that the Council would approve the request.

Mrs. SYAHRUDDIN (Indonesia) and Mrs. SUYANAN (Thailand) said that they endorsed the request of the Philippines.

The PRESIDENT, in answer to a query by Ms. DIEGUEZ-ARMAS (Mexico), said that the United Nations system-wide action plan on drug abuse control, discussed in document E/1990/39 would be considered under draft agenda item 10.

In response to a question by Mr. NAVAJAS-MOGRO (Bolivia) regarding the timing of the Council's consideration of the forthcoming report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) referred to in paragraph 2 of document E/1990/L.25, he said that the Council could, if it wished, decide at its second regular session to consider the UNEP report before its transmission to the General Assembly, at the resumed session the Council would be holding in September to consider the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC).

Mr. NAVAJAS-MOGRO (Bolivia) proposed that the implementation of the Declaration on International Economic Co-operation, in particular the Revitalization of the Economic Growth and Development of the Developing Countries, adopted at the eighteenth special session of the General Assembly, should be included as a further sub-item under draft agenda item 7 on development and international economic co-operation.

Mr. NOGUEIRA-BATISTA (Brazil) supported the Bolivian proposal. It would, in fact, be useful to ensure the presence of the executive heads of the specialized agencies at the Council's discussion of the follow-up to the Declaration.

The PRESIDENT said he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Council decided to approve its provisional agenda for the second regular session of 1990 (E/1990/L.25, chap. I), as orally revised, to include, under draft item 7, an additional sub-item regarding the implementation of the Declaration adopted at the eighteenth special session of the General Assembly, and to include for consideration, under draft item 15, the question of the membership of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; and to approve the proposed organization of work for the second regular session of 1990 (E/1990/L.25, chap. II), as orally revised.

It was so decided.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The PRESIDENT declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.